

Section 4A
Comparison of Water Demands with
Water Supplies to Determine Needs
[31 TAC §357.7(a)(5-7)]

4A.1 Introduction

In this section, the demand projections from Section 2 and the supply projections from Section 3, are brought together to estimate projected water needs in the region through year 2060.

As a recap, Section 2 presents demand projections for six types of use: municipal, manufacturing, steam-electric, mining, irrigation, and livestock. The projections are for dry-year demands. Section 3 presents estimates of surface water and groundwater availability.

4A.1.1 Methods to Estimate Available Water Supplies in the Region

4A.1.1.1 Surface Water Supplies

Surface water in the region available to meet projected demands consists of firm yield of reservoirs, dependable supply of run-of-river water rights through drought of record conditions, and local on-farm sources. Contracts and/or rights to reservoirs, and run-of-river rights were allocated as supplies to their stated type of use: municipal, industrial (manufacturing, steam-electric, and mining), and irrigation. Additionally, municipal supply was further allocated among cities and other municipal water supply entities. This was done by obtaining water seller information (i.e., which contract/right holders – a wholesaler – are reselling water to other water supply entities) and water purchase contract limits between buyers and sellers. This information was obtained from TWDB files and follow-up queries to water supply entities. All water supply contracts were assumed to be renewed at their existing levels unless input was given to the contrary by local entities.

Water associated with a wholesaler that is not resold remains as an available supply to the wholesaler in the supply tables. In the case where a wholesaler's supply is deficient to meet its own demands and contractual commitments, it was assumed that contracts would not be met as well. In these cases, the supply available from each customer's contract was prorated down according the contract amount.

It was assumed that all livestock demands would be met from local water sources (e.g., shallow groundwater, stock ponds).

In certain instances the entity's available water supply is constrained by lack of infrastructure. For example, an entity may hold a contract to divert water from a reservoir; however, the required pipeline has not been built. In this instance, the contract amount would not be included in the entity's available water supply.

In some instances, specific operational, contractual, or legal constraints required modifications to the general surface water allocation procedure. For example, provision in the current contract between the City of Abilene and the West Central Texas Municipal Water District for supplies to the City from Hubbard Creek Reservoir preclude the City from receiving its normal pro-rata share of the reservoir's safe yield during times when the reservoir is significantly drawn down. However, the other member cities of the district (Anson, Albany, and Breckenridge) do not have similar provisions in their contracts with the district.

4A.1.1.2 Groundwater Allocation

Total groundwater availability in the region was determined based on the specific methods identified for each aquifer as discussed in Section 3.4. Total groundwater availability is shown for each county, by aquifer, in Table 3-14. For each county, total available groundwater was allocated among the six user groups—municipal, manufacturing, steam-electric, mining, irrigation, and livestock—in the following manner:

- Municipal supplies from each aquifer were estimated as follows:
 - a. For cities using groundwater sources, supply is based upon well capacities. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the total availability, supply is prorated downward for every entity using that particular source.
 - b. For rural areas, it is assumed that the rural household (municipal type) demand would be met from aquifers underlying that river basin portion of the county. The rural supply is generally calculated as 125 percent of the year 2000 use from each particular aquifer. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the total availability, supply is prorated downward for every entity using that particular source.
- Industrial supply from groundwater sources is associated with aquifers underlying the river basin portion of the county. The industrial supply is generally calculated as 130 percent of the year 2000 use from each particular aquifer. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the

- total availability, supply is prorated downwards for every entity using that particular source.
- Steam-electric supply from groundwater sources is associated with aquifers underlying the river basin portion of the county. The steam-electric supply is generally calculated as 130 percent of the year 2000 use from each particular aquifer. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the total availability, supply is prorated downward for every entity using that particular source.
 - Irrigation supply from groundwater sources is associated with aquifers underlying the river basin portion of the county. The irrigation supply is calculated as being equal to the projected demand in each decade. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the total availability, supply is prorated downward for every entity using that particular source.
 - Mining supply from groundwater sources is associated with aquifers underlying the river basin portion of the county. The mining supply is calculated as being equal to the projected demand in each decade. For cases in which the total demand on that portion (i.e., county and river basin) of the aquifer exceeds the total availability, supply is prorated downward for every entity using that particular source.

In some specific instances, these general procedures were modified to more accurately reflect the interactions between water demands, supplies, and needs. The demands and supplies for College Station as a WUG include Texas A&M University, by TWDB definition. However, Texas A&M utilizes its own supply source separate from the City. Recent improvements to the university's supply wells and effective water conservation efforts have increased supply surpluses to meet the university's demands. This surplus should not be considered as excess supply available to the City because the two utilities are interconnected only for emergency purposes. For College Station as a WUG, the supply from Texas A&M University wells was set equal to the university's projected demands (supplied by Texas A&M), in order to more accurately define needs for College Station.

4A.2 Water Needs Projections for Water User Groups

If projected demands exceed projected supplies for a water user group, the difference or shortage, is identified as a water need for that water user group. This section contains a summary of the water needs (shortages) for each Water User Group (WUG) located in the Brazos G Area. Tables in Appendix C provide a detailed analysis of water needs for each water user group by county as well as a summary for the region as a whole. The following sections summarize the data presented in Appendix C.

4A.2.1 Projected Municipal Shortages

Water shortages are projected for 92 municipal WUGs, which are listed in Table 4A-1, along with the projected year 2030 and 2060 shortages, and the approximate decade that shortages are expected to begin. Thirty of the 37 counties in the Brazos G Area are projected to have at least one municipal WUG shortage. The County-Other category includes water supply corporations, water districts, privately owned utilities, and small towns that generally supplied less than 280 acft of water in the year 2000. The County-Other category is projected to be water short in 15 counties: Bosque, Coryell, Eastland, Falls, Hood, Johnson, Kent, Knox, Lampasas, McLennan, Nolan, Palo Pinto, Somervell, Stephens, and Williamson.

4A.2.2 Projected Manufacturing Shortages

Table 4A-2 lists the counties projected to have shortages in the Manufacturing Use category, projected year 2030 and 2060 shortages, and the approximate decade shortages are projected to begin. Eighteen of the 37 counties in the Brazos G area are projected to have manufacturing shortages, with the largest shortages occurring in Johnson, Williamson, Bell, and Bosque Counties.

4A.2.3 Projected Steam-Electric Shortages

Table 4A-3 lists the nine counties projected to have shortages in the Steam-Electric Use category, projected year 2030 and 2060 shortages, and the approximate decade shortages are projected begin.

**Table 4A-1.
Municipal WUGs with Projected Water Shortages**

County	Shortages Begin	Projected Shortages (acft/yr)	
		Year 2030	Year 2060
Bell County			
Bartlett (P)	2010	(85)	(99)
Bell-Milam-Falls (P)	2020	(39)	(76)
Dog Ridge WSC	2010	(205)	(311)
Elm Creek WSC (P)	2010	(181)	(206)
Jarrell-Schwertner WSC (P)	2060	0	(1)
Killeen	2050	0	(2,157)
Little River Academy	2010	(20)	(29)
Morgans Point Resort	2010	(202)	(255)
Bosque County			
Childress Creek WSC	2010	(193)	(206)
Cross Country WSC (P)	2010	(29)	(32)
Meridian	2010	(68)	(69)
Valley Mills	2010	(103)	(102)
Walnut Springs	2010	(60)	(59)
County-Other	2010	(842)	(919)
Brazos County			
Bryan	2050	0	(1,341)
College Station	2020	(5,603)	(11,166)
Wickson Creek SUD (P)	2020	(474)	(1,074)
Burleson County			
Southwest Milam WSC (P)	2010	(21)	(34)
Callahan County			
Coleman County WSC (P)	2010	(44)	(26)
Potosi WSC (P)	2010	(1)	(0)
Comanche County			
None			
Coryell County			
Elm Creek WSC (P)	2010	(69)	(96)
Gatesville	2040	0	(1,232)
County-Other	2010	(2,103)	(2,776)
Eastland County			
Rising Star	2010	(10)	0
County-Other	2010	(205)	(99)
Erath County			
None			

Page 1 of 4

Table 4A-1 (continued)

County	Shortages Begin	Projected Shortages (acft/yr)	
		Year 2030	Year 2060
Falls County			
Bell-Milam-Falls WSC (P)	2010	(115)	(241)
Elm Creek WSC (P)	2010	(7)	(11)
West Brazos WSC (P)	2010	(250)	(351)
County-Other	2010	(111)	0
Fisher County			
Rotan ¹	2010	(1)	(33)
Grimes County			
Wickson Creek SUD (P)	2010	(665)	(1,017)
Hamilton County			
None			
Haskell County			
Haskell	2010	(383)	(472)
Rule	2010	0	0
Hill County			
Brandon-Irene WSC	2050	0	(92)
Hillsboro	2060	0	(20)
Parker WSC (P)	2010	(46)	(58)
White Bluff Community WS	2010	(341)	(663)
Woodrow-Osceola WSC	2010	(120)	(154)
Hood County			
Oak Trail Shores Sub.	2010	(114)	(101)
County-Other	2010	(1,195)	(3,543)
Johnson County			
Alvarado	2010	(473)	(647)
Bethany WSC	2010	(344)	(515)
Bethesda WSC	2010	(3,722)	(6,703)
Burleson	2010	(1,910)	(3,996)
Cleburne	2050	0	(2,853)
Godley	2010	(224)	(403)
Grand View	2060	0	(1)
Johnson County FWSD #1	2040	0	(609)
Johnson County SUD	2030	(2,482)	(13,259)
Joshua	2010	(782)	(1,163)
Mountain Peak WSC	2010	(421)	(888)
Parker WSC (P)	2010	(354)	(617)
Rio Vista	2010	(69)	(106)
County-Other	2010	(2,516)	(2,977)
¹ These apparent needs are negated with a Water Management Strategy in Region F involving subordination of downstream senior water rights in the Colorado River Basin. No strategy is, therefore, identified in the Fisher County plan for Rotan (Section 4C.11), but it is identified in the TWDB DB07 database.			

Table 4A-1 (continued)

County	Shortages Begin	Projected Shortages (acft/yr)	
		Year 2030	Year 2060
Jones County			
Abilene (P)	2010	(589)	(507)
Kent County			
County-Other	2010	(16)	(3)
Knox County			
Knox City	2010	(153)	(216)
Munday	2010	(185)	(250)
County-Other	2010	(26)	(22)
Lampasas County			
County-Other	2010	(703)	(845)
Lee County			
Aqua WSC (P)	2020	(83)	(176)
Giddings	2030	(91)	(354)
Lee County WSC	2010	(515)	(726)
Southwest Milam WSC (P)	2020	(10)	(23)
Limestone County			
Groesbeck	2060	0	(87)
McLennan County			
Chalk Bluff WSC	2010	(550)	(749)
Crawford	2010	(60)	(65)
Cross County WSC (P)	2010	(492)	(612)
Elm Creek WSC (P)	2010	(222)	(318)
Gholson	2010	(175)	(222)
Hallsburg	2010	(148)	(172)
Mart	2010	(342)	(390)
North Bosque WSC	2010	(479)	(679)
Riesel	2010	(112)	(129)
West	2010	(411)	(442)
West Brazos WSC (P)	2010	(180)	(229)
Western Hills WS	2010	(489)	(663)
County-Other	2010	(6,067)	(6,786)
Milam County			
Bell-Milam-Falls WSC (P)	2010	(74)	(105)
Southwest Milam WSC (P)	2040	0	(77)
Nolan County			
Roscoe	2010	(42)	(17)
Sweetwater	2010	(2,026)	(1,693)
County-Other	2010	(27)	(4)
Palo Pinto County			
Strawn	2020	(7)	(23)
County-Other	2010	(203)	(637)
Robertson County			
Wickson Creek SUD (P)	2010	(21)	(25)

Page 3 of 4

Table 4A-1 (concluded)

County	Shortages Begin	Projected Shortages (acft/yr)	
		Year 2030	Year 2060
Shackelford County None			
Somervell County County-Other	2010	(231)	(260)
Stephens County County-Other	2010	(216)	(193)
Stonewall County Aspermont	2010	0	0
Taylor County Abilene (P)	2010	(13,482)	(12,466)
Coleman County WSC (P)	2010	(20)	(18)
Merkel	2010	(85)	(52)
Potosi WSC (P)	2010	(119)	(84)
Tye	2010	(43)	(29)
Throckmorton County None			
Washington County None			
Williamson County Aqua WSC (P)	2010	(30)	(88)
Bartlett (P)	2010	(61)	(90)
Bell-Milam-Falls WSC (P)	2010	(33)	(92)
Cedar Park	2030	(6,650)	(26,819)
Chisholm Trail SUD	2030	(1,021)	(7,927)
Florence	2020	(63)	(232)
Georgetown	2060	0	(3,429)
Hutto	2010	(407)	(780)
Jarrell-Schwertner WSC (P)	2020	(374)	(1,415)
Jonah Water SUD	2040	0	(1,531)
Leander	2060	0	(232)
Liberty Hill	2010	(788)	(1,722)
Round Rock	2020	(10,566)	(42,548)
Southwest Milam WSC (P)	2010	(161)	(418)
Thrall	2010	(144)	(239)
Weir	2010	(277)	(557)
County-Other	2040	0	(3,125)
Young County None			
Number of utility-specific WUGs on list:	Number of County-Others:	Total:	
74	15	89	
(P) Indicates WUG is in multiple counties.			

Page 4 of 4

**Table 4A-2.
Counties with Projected Water Shortages
for Manufacturing Use**

County	Shortages Begin	Projected Shortages (acft/yr)	
		Year 2030	Year 2060
Bell County	2010	(1,163)	(1,446)
Bosque County	2010	(921)	(1,300)
Brazos County	2020	(96)	(232)
Burleson County	2040	0	(98)
Erath County	2020	(16)	(40)
Fisher County	2010	(155)	(236)
Grimes County	2010	(80)	(189)
Hill County	2020	(21)	(53)
Hood County	2010	(8)	(15)
Johnson County	2010	(2,546)	(3,639)
Lampasas County	2010	(135)	(169)
Limestone County	2010	(44)	(69)
McLennan County	2010	(1,089)	(1,508)
Nolan County	2040	0	(239)
Robertson County	2020	(31)	(77)
Somervell County	2010	(4)	(7)
Washington County	2020	(70)	(199)
Williamson County	2010	(1,583)	(2,328)

**Table 4A-3.
Counties with Projected Water Shortages
for Steam-Electric Use**

County	Shortages Begin	Projected Shortages (acft/yr)	
		Year 2030	Year 2060
Bosque County	2010	(3,497)	(8,223)
Grimes County	2030	(727)	(9,715)
Johnson County	2010	(1,200)	(1,200)
Limestone County	2040	0	(15,814)
McLennan	2010	(21,628)	(34,016)
Milam County	2010	(4,700)	(8,200)
Nolan County	2010	(1,377)	(2,817)
Palo Pinto County	2040	0	(1,658)
Robertson County	2040	0	(8,284)

4A.2.4 Projected Mining Shortages

Table 4A-4 lists the 10 counties projected to have shortages in the Mining Use category, projected year 2030 and 2060 shortages, and the approximate decade shortages are projected to begin. Significant shortages are projected for Stephens and Williamson Counties. Mining water use in Williamson County is primarily associated with dewatering for quarry operations.

4A.2.5 Projected Irrigation Shortages

Table 4A-5 lists the seven counties projected to have shortages in the Irrigation Use category, projected year 2030 and 2060 shortages, and the approximate decade shortages are projected to begin.

4A.2.6 Projected Livestock Shortages

There are no livestock shortages. As explained in Section 3, livestock demands were assumed to be met from stock tanks and locally-occurring groundwater

Table 4A-4.
Counties with Projected Water Shortages
for Mining Use

County	Shortages Begin	Projected Shortages (acft/yr)	
		Year 2030	Year 2060
Haskell County	2010	(52)	(47)
Hood County	2010	(25)	(24)
Johnson County	2010	(285)	(315)
Knox County	2010	(3)	(3)
Lampasas County	2010	(24)	(23)
Nolan County	2010	(199)	(197)
Somervell County	2010	(94)	(85)
Stephens County	2010	(5,884)	(6,662)
Taylor County	2010	(5)	(4)
Williamson County	2010	(1,576)	(1,882)

Table 4A-5.
Counties with Projected Water Shortages
for Irrigation Use

County	Shortages Begin	Projected Shortages (acft/yr)	
		Year 2030	Year 2060
Burleson County	2010	(3,993)	(2,991)
Eastland County	2010	(9,224)	(9,257)
Haskell County	2010	(25,936)	(21,950)
Knox County	2010	(13,317)	(10,460)
Nolan County	2010	(2,914)	(2,566)
Shackelford County	2010	(99)	(81)
Throckmorton County	2010	(3,988)	(3,988)

4A.3 Water Needs for Wholesale Water Providers

The TWDB's definition of a Wholesale Water Provider (WWP) is:

“A WWP is any person or entity, including river authorities and irrigation districts, that has contracts to sell more than 1,000 acft of water wholesale in any one year during the five years immediately preceding the adoption of the last Regional Water Plan. The Planning Groups shall include as wholesale water providers other persons and entities that enter or that the Planning Group expects or recommends to enter contracts to sell more than 1,000 acft of wholesale water during the period covered by the plan.”

Under this definition, the list of WWPs for the Brazos G Region is as follows:

- Brazos River Authority
- Aquilla Water Supply District
- Bell County WCID No. 1
- Bluebonnet WSC
- Central Texas WSC
- Upper Leon Municipal Water District
- Eastland County Water Supply District
- Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District
- West Central Texas Municipal Water District
- North Central Texas Municipal Water District
- City of Abilene
- City of Cedar Park
- City of Round Rock
- City of Sweetwater
- City of Waco

In addition, to these WWPs, there are other WWPs that provide water to the Brazos G Region. These include the Lower Colorado River Authority (Region K), Colorado Municipal Water District (Region F), and the Trinity River Authority (Region C). Water supply plans will be developed for these entities by the regional water planning groups in the planning regions in which they are primarily located.

4A.3.1 Wholesale Water Provider Summary Tables

Summaries for each WWP, including a brief description, contracts for water sales, and supplies are provided in Tables 4A-6 through 4A-20. Projected demands are total contracts or projected demands of customer entities, whichever is greater, plus demands to be met from water management strategies recommended for that WWP.

**Table 4A-6.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
Brazos River Authority**

Name: Brazos River Authority						
Description: The largest provider of water in the Brazos G Region is the Brazos River Authority (BRA). The BRA also operates water and wastewater treatment systems, has programs to assess and protect water quality, does water supply planning and supports water conservation efforts in the Brazos River Basin. BRA provides water from three wholly owned and operated reservoirs in the region: Lake Granbury, Possum Kingdom Lake, and Lake Limestone. BRA also contracts for conservation storage space in the nine U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reservoirs in the region: Lakes Waco, Proctor, Belton, Stillhouse Hollow, Georgetown, Granger, Somerville, Whitney, and Aquilla. The total permitted capacity of these twelve reservoirs in the BRA system is approximately 2.3 million acft. BRA holds rights for diversion in the region totaling more than 660,000 acft, and contracts to supply water to municipal, industrial and agricultural water customers in the BGRWPA and other regions. BRA's largest municipal customers in 2000 included Bell County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1, the City of Round Rock, and the Central Texas Water Supply Corporation. For planning purposes, the overall BRA system has been divided into three separate systems: the Lake Aquilla system consisting of Lake Aquilla and its associated contracts; the Little River System consisting of Lake Proctor, Lake Belton, Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir, Lake Georgetown, and Lake Granger; and the Main Stem/Lower Basin System consisting of Possum Kingdom Reservoir, Lake Granbury, Lake Whitney, Lake Somerville, and Lake Limestone. The demands shown below include the projected demands for water from the proposed BRA System Operation appropriation.						
Projected Demands:						
Major Long-Term Water Contracts/ Future Sales (as of June 2005)	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Aquilla System ^{1,2}	11,403	11,403	11,403	11,403	11,403	11,403
Little River System ²	212,323	212,323	212,323	212,573	239,923	243,389
Main Stem/Lower Basin System (Brazos G) ²	470,058	477,447	478,959	514,682	516,845	523,520
Main Stem/Lower Basin System (Region H) ³	301,258	301,258	326,481	326,481	369,806	375,406
Projected Total Demand	995,042	1,002,431	1,029,166	1,065,139	1,137,977	1,153,718
¹ Demands for Lake Aquilla System in excess of current contracts are assumed to be met from Main Stem/Lower Basin System.						
² Demands include 460,586 acft/yr of current contracts (combined 3 systems) in Brazos G, 2,761 acft/yr of current contracts in Region O and Region C, and future demands to be met by the BRA in Brazos G and Region C. Future demands will be met from uncontracted BRA supply, BRA System Operations, and Lake Granger Augmentation. See Section 4C for details concerning individual WUG and WWP plans. Demands do not include BRA/LCRA Alliance supply. See Table 4A-21 for summary of supplies assumed available to Region C and Region O.						
³ Demands include 138,913 acft/yr of current contracts and future demands to be met by the BRA in Region H. Future demands in Region H are to be met from uncontracted BRA supply, BRA System Operations, Allens Creek Reservoir, Little River Off-Channel Reservoir, and Freeport Desalination. See Table 4A-21 for summary of supplies assumed available to Region H.						
Supplies (reservoir firm yield):						
Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Aquilla System	12,437	10,978	9,519	8,060	6,601	5,142
Little River System	211,856	209,425	206,994	204,561	202,130	199,699
Main Stem/Lower Basin System	414,491	412,465	410,439	408,412	406,386	404,360
Total Supply	638,784	632,868	626,952	621,033	615,117	609,201
Projected Balances:						
	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Aquilla System	1,034	(425)	(1,884)	(3,343)	(4,802)	(6,261)
Little River System	(467)	(2,898)	(5,329)	(8,012)	(37,793)	(43,690)
Main Stem/Lower Basin System	(356,825)	(366,240)	(395,001)	(432,751)	(480,265)	(494,566)
Total Balance/(Shortage) ¹	(356,258)	(369,563)	(402,214)	(444,106)	(522,860)	(544,517)

**Table 4A-7.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
Aquila Water Supply District**

Name: Aquilla Water Supply District

Description: Aquilla Water Supply District is located in Hill County, and obtains raw water from Lake Aquilla through a contract with the BRA. The district supplies treated water to six wholesale customers. The City of Hillsboro is the district's largest customer, and purchased 3,889 acft in 2000. Total sales for Aquilla Water Supply District in 2000 were 4,844 acft.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Brandon-Irene WSC	280	280	280	280	280	280
Chatt WSC	84	84	84	84	84	84
Files Valley WSC	1,008	1,008	1,008	1,008	1,008	1,008
Hill Country WSC	336	336	336	336	336	336
Hillsboro	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200	4,200
Menlow WSC	45	45	45	45	45	45
Total Demand	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953

Supply:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Aquilla (BRA Contract)	5,433	4,912	4,392	3,871	3,351	2,830

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	(520)	(1,041)	(1,561)	(2,082)	(2,602)	(3,123)

**Table 4A-8.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
Bell County WCID No. 1**

Name: Bell County Water Control and Improvement District No.1

Description: Bell County Water Control and Improvement District (WCID) No. 1 obtains and treats water for its customers from Lake Belton through a contract with the Brazos River Authority for 49,509 acft/yr. Bell County WCID No. 1 also diverts and treats water for Fort Hood using the Department of the Army’s water right in Lake Belton, which, for planning purposes, is not listed as a supply for Bell County WCID No. 1.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Belton	4,966	4,966	4,966	4,966	4,966	4,966
City of Copperas Cove	7,824	7,824	7,824	7,824	7,824	7,824
City of Harker Heights	5,265	5,265	5,265	5,265	5,265	5,265
City of Killeen	29,964	29,964	29,964	29,964	30,064	32,464
City of Nolanville (Bell Co. WCID No. 3)	740	740	740	740	740	740
439 Water Supply Corp	750	750	750	750	750	750
Total Demand	49,509	49,509	49,509	49,509	49,609	52,009

Supply:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Belton (BRA Contract)	49,417	49,325	49,234	49,142	49,050	48,958

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	(92)	(184)	(275)	(367)	(559)	(3,051)

**Table 4A-9.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
Bluebonnet Water Supply Corporation**

Name: Bluebonnet Water Supply Corporation

Description: The Bluebonnet Water Supply Corporation (WSC) is located in Bell County. The WSC obtains raw water from Lake Belton, and sells treated water to nine entities in the BGRWPA. The largest customer is the City of McGregor, which purchased 943 acft in 2000. Wholesale sales in year 2000 totaled 2,848 acft.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Bruceville-Eddy	827	964	1,081	1,200	1,275	1,389
Elm Creek WSC	480	580	580	680	680	780
City of McGregor	933	923	913	902	894	899
Moffat WSC	402	430	457	468	477	488
City of Moody	202	203	203	204	206	212
Pendleton WSC	250	265	273	278	282	287
Spring Valley WSC	250	298	331	336	331	331
Total Demand	3,344	3,663	3,838	4,068	4,145	4,386

Supply:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Belton (BRA Contract)	8,286	8,270	8,255	8,240	8,224	8,209

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	4,942	4,607	4,417	4,172	4,079	3,823

**Table 4A-10.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
Central Texas Water Supply Corporation**

Name: Central Texas Water Supply Corporation

Description: The Central Texas Water Supply Corporation (WSC) provides water to a number of water supply corporations and cities in Bell, Williamson, and Lampasas Counties. The Central Texas WSC obtains water under contract with the Brazos River Authority from Lake Stillhouse Hollow.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Armstrong WSC	92	92	92	92	92	92
City of Bartlett	180	180	180	180	180	180
Bell County WCID No. 5	37	37	37	37	37	37
Bell-Milam-Falls WSC	546	646	746	846	946	1,046
Coryell County-Other	200	600	1,000	1,200	1,400	1,600
Dog Ridge WSC	771	871	971	971	971	1,071
East Bell County WSC	341	341	341	341	341	341
City of Holland	258	258	258	258	258	258
Kempner WSC	3,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500
Little Elm Valley WSC	147	147	147	147	147	147
City of Lott	184	184	184	184	184	184
City of Rodgers	368	368	368	368	368	368
City of Rosebud	500	500	500	500	500	500
Salado WSC	0	100	250	300	350	400
Town of Buckholts-Water Dept.	174	174	174	174	174	174
Town of Oenaville and Belfalls	57	57	57	57	57	57
West Bell County WSC	921	921	921	921	921	921
Westphalia WSC	45	45	45	45	45	45
Total Demand	10,321	11,021	11,771	12,121	12,471	12,921

Supply:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Stillhouse Hollow (BRA Contract)	12,772	12,748	12,725	12,702	12,678	12,655

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	2,451	1,727	954	581	207	(266)

**Table 4A-11.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
Upper Leon Municipal Water District**

Name: Upper Leon Municipal Water District

Description: The Upper Leon Municipal Water District obtains water from Lake Proctor through contracts with the BRA. The MWD provides treated water to the Cities of Comanche, De Leon, Dublin, Gorman, and Hamilton. The MWD also has a contract to sell water to Stephenville, but the infrastructure is not complete. Total 2000 sales were 2,445 acft.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Comanche	634	632	622	605	587	568
City of De Leon	280	280	274	265	256	248
City of Dublin	485	516	544	576	682	753
City of Gorman	137	134	127	120	113	108
City of Hamilton	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
City of Stephenville	1,862	1,862	1,862	1,862	1,862	1,862
Total Demand	5,398	5,424	5,429	5,428	5,500	5,539

Supply:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Proctor (BRA Contract)	6,427	6,415	6,404	6,392	6,380	6,368

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	1,029	991	975	964	880	829

**Table 4A-12.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
Eastland County Water Supply District**

Name: Eastland County Water Supply District

Description: The Eastland County Water Supply District owns and operates Lake Leon and has a water right to divert 5,800 acft for municipal and industrial purposes and 500 acft for irrigation. The district currently provides treated water to entities in Eastland County through the Cities of Eastland and Ranger. Total water sales in 2000 were 1,762 acft.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Eastland	1,791	1,791	1,791	1,791	1,791	1,791
City of Carbon	73	73	73	73	73	73
Eastland County-Other	300	300	300	300	300	300
Westbound WSC	47	47	47	47	47	47
City of Ranger	710	710	710	710	710	710
Total Demand	2,291	2,291	2,291	2,291	2,291	2,291

Supplies:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Run-of-the-River Right	450	450	450	450	450	450
Lake Leon	5,451	5,451	5,451	5,451	5,451	5,451
Total Supply	5,901	5,901	5,901	5,901	5,901	5,901

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	2,980	2,980	2,980	2,980	2,980	2,980

**Table 4A-13.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District**

Name: Palo Pinto County Municipal Water District

Description: Palo Pinto Municipal Water District owns and operates Lake Palo Pinto, which is used to supply water to entities in Palo Pinto and Parker Counties. The district has rights to 18,500 acft a year for municipal and steam electric power uses. Treated water is supplied to the City of Mineral Wells (and its customers) and Lake Palo Pinto Water Association. Wholesale municipal sales totaled 4,616 acft in 2000 and steam electric power sales were 1,378 acft.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Mineral Wells ¹	3,653	3,802	3,928	4,008	4,151	4,337
City of Graford	92	92	92	92	92	92
Palo Pinto County Steam-Electric	2,024	2,024	2,024	2,024	2,024	2,024
Palo Pinto County-Other	994	994	994	994	994	994
Parker County-Other (Region C)	759	759	759	759	759	759
Parker County Manufacturing (Region C)	275	275	275	275	275	275
Total Demand	7,797	7,946	8,072	8,152	8,295	8,481

¹ Includes supply to portion of Mineral Wells located in Region C.

Supply:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Palo Pinto	8,193	7,887	7,580	7,273	6,967	6,660

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	396	(59)	(492)	(879)	(1,328)	(1,821)

**Table 4A-14.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
West Central Texas Municipal Water District**

Name: West Central Texas Municipal Water District

Description: The West Central Texas Municipal Water District (MWD) holds water rights in Hubbard Creek Reservoir that authorize it to divert up to 56,000 acft of water per year from the reservoir for municipal, industrial, irrigation, mining, domestic, and livestock use. The District provides raw water to its member cities of Abilene, Albany, Anson, and Breckenridge. The District holds a long-term contract with the Colorado River Municipal Water District (CRMWD) for 16 percent of the yield in O.H. Ivie Reservoir (~15,000 acft) and a supporting contract with the City of Abilene to provide this water to the city.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Abilene	20,361	20,361	20,361	20,361	20,361	20,361
City of Albany	2,197	2,197	2,197	2,197	2,197	2,197
City of Anson	2,409	2,409	2,409	2,409	2,409	2,409
City of Breckenridge	2,881	2,881	2,881	2,881	2,881	2,881
Total Demand	27,848	27,848	27,848	27,848	27,848	27,848

Supply:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Hubbard Creek Reservoir	17,325	17,210	17,095	16,980	16,865	16,750

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	(10,523)	(10,638)	(10,753)	(10,868)	(10,983)	(11,098)

**Table 4A-15.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
North Central Texas Municipal Water District**

Name: North Central Texas Municipal Water District

Description: North Central Texas Municipal Water District supplies treated water to entities in Knox, Haskell and Stonewall Counties. The district has water rights to divert 5,000 acft from Millers Creek Reservoir for municipal, industrial, and mining purposes. Wholesale water sales totaled 1,410 acft in 2000.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Aspermont	93	93	93	93	93	93
City of Benjamin	8	8	8	8	8	8
City of Goree	63	63	63	63	63	63
City of Haskell	504	504	504	504	504	504
City of Knox City	267	267	267	267	267	267
City of Munday	281	281	281	281	281	281
City of O'Brian	6	6	6	6	6	6
City of Rochester	13	13	13	13	13	13
City of Rule	30	30	30	30	30	30
Paint Creek WSC	54	54	54	54	54	54
Total Demand	1,319	1,319	1,319	1,319	1,319	1,319

Supply:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Millers Creek Reservoir	583	467	350	233	117	0

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	(739)	(852)	(969)	(1,086)	(1,202)	(1,319)

Table 4A-16.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
City of Abilene

Name/Location: City of Abilene

Description: The City of Abilene relies on Lakes Fort Phantom Hill, Kirby, and Abilene and water from West Central Texas MWD to meet its needs. The City also has a contract with West Central Texas MWD for ~15,000 acft from O.H Ivie Reservoir, owned by the Colorado River Municipal Water District. The City provides treated water to several entities in the area.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Abilene	22,891	23,485	23,507	23,181	22,588	21,879
Blair WSC	107	107	107	107	107	107
City of Baird	138	138	138	138	138	138
City of Clyde	307	307	307	307	307	307
City of Hamlin	307	307	307	307	307	307
City of Merkel	384	384	384	384	384	384
City of Stamford	537	537	537	537	537	537
City of Tye	138	138	138	138	138	138
Eula WSC	61	61	61	61	61	61
Hamby WSC	307	307	307	307	307	307
Hawley WSC	307	307	307	307	307	307
Potosi WSC	307	307	307	307	307	307
Steamboat Mountain WSC	460	460	460	460	460	460
Sun WSC	307	307	307	307	307	307
View Caps WSC	368	368	368	368	368	368
Taylor County Manufacturing	972	1,081	1,177	1,270	1,349	1,462
Total Demand	27,898	28,601	28,719	28,486	27,972	27,376

Supplies:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Abilene ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fort Phantom Hill	4,848	4,767	4,685	4,603	4,522	4,440
Lake Kirby ²	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake O.H. Ivie (Colorado River MWD) ³	6,720	6,720	6,720	6,720	6,720	6,720
West Central Texas MWD	3,243	3,243	3,243	3,243	3,243	3,243
Total Supply	14,811	14,730	14,648	14,566	14,485	14,403

¹ Lake Abilene is not considered a dependable supply by the City and is currently not used. The reservoir went dry during the recent and ongoing drought with zero demand on the reservoir.

² Lake Kirby is used primarily to store reuse water for the City's reuse customers. Reuse demands are not included in the water demand projections for the City.

³ Current treatment capacity (desalination) is approximately 6 MGD (6,720 acft/yr).

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	(13,087)	(13,871)	(14,071)	(13,920)	(13,487)	(12,973)

**Table 4A-17.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
City of Cedar Park**

Name: City of Cedar Park

Description: The City of Cedar Park is located in Williamson County and provides wholesale water to entities in Williamson and Travis Counties. In 2000, the City purchased all of its raw water from the LCRA Highland Lakes System (Region K). The City sold 2,378 acft to its wholesale customers and provided 6,000 acft of water to retail customers. The City’s largest wholesale customer in 2000 was the City of Leander.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Cedar Park	10,744	14,886	20,708	25,883	31,068	37,892
Indian Springs Subdivision.	9	9	9	9	9	9
Williamson County MUD #3	722	722	722	722	722	722
Williamson-Travis Co. MUD #1	770	1,085	1,462	1,865	2,320	2,807
Blockhouse MUD	903	1,288	1,749	2,242	2,796	3,389
Total Demand	13,148	17,990	24,650	30,721	36,915	44,819

Supply:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Highland Lakes System (LCRA)	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	4,852	10	(6,650)	(12,721)	(18,915)	(26,819)

**Table 4A-18.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
City of Round Rock**

Name: City of Round Rock

Description: The City of Round Rock obtains raw water from the Edwards-BFZ (Northern Segment) Aquifer and purchases additional water from BRA through Lake Georgetown. The City sells wholesale water to local providers in Williamson County. Its largest customer, Brushy Creek MUD, bought 1,999 acft in 2000. In addition to the 3,090 acft of wholesale water sales in 2000, the City provided approximately 14,000 acft of treated water to retail and manufacturing customers. The City of Round Rock has contracted to purchase 18,134 acft/yr from the BRA at Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir in Bell County. The pipeline that delivers this water to Lake Georgetown was completed in late 2004.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Round Rock	19,239	25,937	33,896	42,617	52,298	62,680
Fern Bluff MUD	1,339	2,049	2,882	3,805	4,810	5,888
Williamson County MUD #9	230	257	269	278	282	288
Total Demand	20,808	28,243	37,047	46,700	57,390	68,856

Supplies:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Stillhouse Hollow Reservoir (BRA Contract)	18,101	18,067	18,034	18,000	17,967	17,933
Lake Georgetown (BRA Contract)	6,708	6,695	6,683	6,671	6,658	6,646
Edwards-BFZ (Northern Segment) Aquifer	1,799	1,778	1,765	1,751	1,738	1,729
Total Supply	26,607	26,540	26,482	26,422	26,363	26,308

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	5,799	(1,703)	(10,565)	(20,278)	(31,027)	(42,548)

**Table 4A-19.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
City of Sweetwater**

Name: City of Sweetwater

Description: The City of Sweetwater owns and operates two reservoirs in the BGRWPA, Lake Sweetwater and Lake Trammel, and a groundwater well field in the Dockum Aquifer. The City also owns and operates the Oak Creek Reservoir in Coke County (Region F) in the Colorado River Basin. The City of Sweetwater provides wholesale water to entities in Nolan and Fisher Counties, and the City of Bronte in Region F. The City also has a contract with American Electric Power (AEP) for cooling water from Oak Creek Reservoir. In 2000, Sweetwater sold approximately 750 acft of wholesale water to its municipal customers and 370 acft for steam electric power. At this time, the AEP power plant on Oak Creek Reservoir is not operating due to the low lake levels from the on-going drought in the region.

Projected Demands:

Major Water Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Sweetwater	3,013	3,072	3,081	3,029	2,900	2,763
Bitter Creek WSC	460	460	460	460	460	460
City of Blackwell	168	168	168	168	168	168
City of Bronte	504	504	504	504	504	504
City of Roby	350	350	350	350	350	350
City of Trent	187	187	187	187	187	187
Fort Chadborne Ranch	135	135	135	135	135	135
Nolan County Manufacturing	550	550	550	550	550	550
Fisher County Manufacturing	92	125	155	184	210	236
American Electric Power (AEP)	800	800	800	800	800	800
Total Demand	6,259	6,351	6,390	6,367	6,264	6,153

Supplies:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Run-of-the-River Right	717	717	717	717	717	717
Lake Sweetwater	1,026	1,017	1,008	998	989	980
Dockum Aquifer	1,044	1,049	1,054	1,060	1,065	1,070
Total Supply	2,787	2,783	2,779	2,775	2,771	2,767

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	(3,472)	(3,568)	(3,611)	(3,592)	(3,493)	(3,386)

**Table 4A-20.
Wholesale Water Provider Summary
City of Waco**

Name: City of Waco

Description: In year 2000 the City of Waco obtained raw water from Lake Waco, a small amount of groundwater from the Trinity Aquifer (not considered here) and purchased water from Bluebonnet WSC (not considered here). In 2003, the City, in cooperation with the BRA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, implemented a project to raise the water level in Lake Waco to provide for additional supply. With this additional supply, the City has the right to divert 78,970 acft/yr for municipal and industrial purposes, and 900 acft/yr for irrigation uses. In 2000, the City provided 1,278 acft of treated wholesale water to the City of Hewitt, City of Woodway, and Bosqueville Green Acres WSC. Total water used by Waco in 2000 was over 30,000 acft, including wholesale sales. Irrigation supply from the City's rights is included in McLennan County Irrigation. Projected demands include current contracts and expected revised/new contract amounts, as provided by the City of Waco.

Projected Demands:

Current and Projected Contract Holders	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
City of Waco	24,876	26,453	27,781	29,159	30,033	31,304
City of Bellmead	2,622	2,751	2,873	2,984	3,065	3,202
City of Northcrest	202	191	183	180	179	178
City of Hewitt	1,467	3,294	6,106	6,198	6,293	6,389
City of Lacy-Lakeview	993	1,117	2,070	2,101	2,134	2,166
City of Woodway	2,944	2,925	2,903	2,882	2,867	2,874
City of Beverly Hills	414	416	416	414	416	424
West Brazos WSC	400	400	450	500	550	600
Chalk Bluff WSC	1,160	1,766	2,846	2,881	2,918	2,955
City of Crawford	65	65	65	65	65	70
Cross County WSC	450	500	550	600	650	700
City of Gholson	956	1,462	2,539	2,574	2,611	2,647
City of Hallsburg	150	150	150	160	170	180
City of Mart	350	350	350	400	400	400
North Bosque WSC	350	450	500	600	650	700
City of Riesel	150	150	150	150	150	150
City of West	1,206	1,712	2,789	2,824	2,861	2,897
Western Hills WS	400	500	550	600	650	700
McLennan County-Other	7,840	10,411	14,321	14,445	14,572	14,700
McLennan County Steam-Electric	7,000	3,000	6,000	9,000	14,000	19,000
McLennan County Manufacturing	2,503	2,888	3,249	3,618	3,948	4,275
Total Demand	56,498	60,951	76,841	82,335	89,182	96,511

Supplies:

Source	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Lake Waco (Municipal & Industrial)	78,970	78,970	78,970	78,970	78,970	78,970
Lake Brazos	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600	5,600
Total Supplies	84,570	84,570	84,570	84,570	84,570	84,570

Projected Balance:

	Year (acft/yr)					
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2050	2060
Balance/(Shortage)	28,072	23,619	7,729	2,235	(4,612)	(11,941)

4A.4 Water Supplied to Meet Demands Not in Region G

Water contracts existing at each water source in the Brazos G Area that are currently or projected to provide water to another region were identified. The three BRA systems have been grouped into a single summary table (Table 4A-21). In addition to the BRA, the Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1 has been identified as supplying water out of the Brazos G Area into Region C (Table 4A-22).

4A.5 Social and Economic Impacts of Not Meeting Projected Water Needs

Section 357.7(4) of the rules for implementing Senate Bill 1 requires that the social and economic impacts of not meeting regional water supply needs be evaluated by regional water planning groups. TWDB has provided technical assistance by conducting the required analysis for the Brazos G Regional Water Planning Area using a methodology similar to that used for other regions.

The purpose of this element of Senate Bill 1 planning is to provide an estimate of the social and economic importance of meeting projected water needs or, conversely, to provide estimates of potential costs of not meeting the projected needs of each water user group. The social and economic effects of not meeting a projected water need can be viewed as the potential benefit to be gained from implementing a strategy to meet the particular need. The summation of all the impacts gives a view of the ultimate magnitude of the economic impacts of not meeting all of the projected needs.

The information provided by the TWDB is summarized in a report included in Appendix I.

Table 4A-21.
Supplies from BRA Available to Brazos G and Other Regions
(Existing Supplies and Recommended Water Management Strategies)

The following table summarizes supply and demand of the Brazos River Authority's reservoirs. This summary is used to coordinate water supply from Brazos G used in Region H, Region C, and Region O.

Owner: Brazos River Authority

BRA Reservoirs	2000 (acft/yr)	2030 (acft/yr)	2060 (acft/yr)
Permitted Diversion (Constructed Facilities)	661,901	661,901	661,901
Existing Reservoir Firm Yield (Stand-alone)	644,700	626,952	609,201
Long-Term Contract Holders/ Water Management Strategies			
	Contract Amounts		
In Region G			
Long-term Contracts	460,586	460,586	460,586
Uncontracted Current BRA Supply ¹	31,955	31,955	31,955
BRA System Operations ¹	–	62,196	62,196
In Region H			
Long-term Contracts	138,913	138,913	138,913
Uncontracted Current BRA Supply ¹	29,000	29,000	29,000
BRA System Operations ¹	–	120,000	120,000
Allens Creek Reservoir ²	–	29,895	29,895
Little River Off-Channel Reservoir ³	–	40,000	40,000
Freeport Desalination	–	28,000	28,000
In Region O			
City of Lubbock ⁴	961	961	961
In Region C ⁵			
Parker County Steam Electric	0	4,000	4,000
Vulcan Materials Co.	2,000	2,000	2,000
Total Water Supply Available from BRA System			
Region G	492,541	554,737	554,737
Region H	167,913	385,808	385,808
Region O	961	961	961
Region C	2,000	6,000	6,000
Grand Total	663,415	947,506	947,506
¹ Supplies from current BRA supplies and BRA System Operation as coordinated between Regions G and H. BRA System Operations would develop a maximum supply of 995,946 acft/yr when diverted in the lower basin, including 99,650 acft/yr from Allens Creek Reservoir, but excluding the Little River Off-Channel Reservoir (Vol. II, Table 4B.4-1). Allocation of system supply to upstream locations reduces overall BRA supply from the BRA reservoir system to approximately 945,061 acft/yr. ² Supply from water management strategy in Region H allocated to BRA (30% of 99,650 acft/yr). Region H has allocated 97,410 acft/yr of the supply from the strategy. ³ The Little River Off-Channel Reservoir is a recommended water management strategy in Region H. Operated as part of the BRA System, it would supply an additional 40,000 acft/yr to Region H (Vol. II, Table 4B.4-14). Region H has allocated 32,125 acft/yr of that supply. ⁴ Upstream supply contract to compensate BRA for loss of yield in Possum Kingdom Reservoir caused by Lake Alan Henry. ⁵ Some supplies to Region C are accounted for in BRA contracts with Aquilla Water Supply District.			

Table 4A-22.
Lake Palo Pinto Supplies to Other Regions

Owner: Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1

<i>Lake Palo Pinto</i>	<i>2000 (acft/yr)</i>	<i>2030 (acft/yr)</i>	<i>2060 (acft/yr)</i>
Permitted Diversion	18,500	18,500	18,500
Safe Yield	8,500	7,580	6,660
Major Long-term Contract Holders		Contract Amounts	
In Region G			
City of Mineral Wells ¹	3,412	3,928	4,337
Palo Pinto County-Other	994	994	994
City of Graford	92	92	92
Brazos Electric Coop. (Palo Pinto Steam Electric)	2,024	2,024	2,024
In Region C			
Parker County Other (through Mineral Wells)	759	759	759
Parker County Manufacturing (through Mineral Wells)	275	275	275
Total Surface Water Supply from Palo Pinto County MWD No. 1			
Region G	6,522	7,038	7,447
Region C	1,034	1,034	1,034
Grand Total	7,556	8,072	8,481
¹ Includes supply to portion of Mineral Wells located in Region C.			